DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 864 EC 002 463

By-Hensley, Gene, Ed.; Buck, Dorothy P., Ed.

Cooperative Agreements Between Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the West. Selected Papers from a Conference on Cooperative Agreements (Las Vegas, Nevada, February, 1968).

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.

Spons Agency-Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; United Cerebral Palsy Association, New York, N.Y.

Pub Date Jun 68

Grant-VRA-546T66

Note-44p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.30

Descriptors-*Administration, Administrative Problems, Communication Problems, Cooperative Education, *Cooperative Programs, Cost Effectiveness, Educational Coordination, Equalization Aid, *Exceptional Child Education, Handicapped, Mentally Handicapped, State Agencies, State Federal Aid, *Vocational Education, *Vocational Rehabilitation, Work Study Programs

Five papers discuss cooperative work-study agreements between schools and vocational rehabilitation services in the western states. Areas discussed include the advantages of cooperative agreements, the forms and disadvantages of third party agreements, basic concepts of the programs, and an outline form to use when applying for matching funds; the relationship of special education, rehabilitation and cooperative plans, programs, and agreements; and California's past and present work study programs for the mentally retarded. Also reviewed are research demonstrating the economic feasibility of vocational training for the educable mentally retarded in the public schools and communication problems in work study programs. The conference summary considers the purposes, goals, essence of, and necessity for cooperative agreements. (MK)

ED025864

Cooperative Agreements Between Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the West

WICHE

EC002463

WESTERN COUNCIL ON MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Leo F. Cain, President, California State College at Dominguez, Dominguez Hills, California

***Dr. John D. Cambareri,** Director, Comprehensive State Planning, Idaho State Department of Public Health, Boise

Angie Connor, M. D., Professor of Public Health, University of Hawaii

Sumiko Fujiki, Director, Graduate Program in Psychiatric Nursing, College of Nursing, University of Utah

Herbert S. Gaskill, M.D., Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, School of Medicine

James Grobe, M.D., Maryvale Clinic, Phoenix, Arizona

***Dr. Gordon Hearn,** Dean, School of Social Work, Portland State College, Portland, Oregon

Dr. Garrett Heyns, Olympia, Washington

Ward C. Holbrook, Coordinator of Health, Welfare, and Corrections, Utah Department of Public Welfare, Salt Lake City

Dr. Irving Katz, Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Psychology, Nevada Southern University, Las Vegas

J. Ray Langdon, M.D., Anchorage, Alaska

***Ralph Littlestone,** Chief of Planning, California Department of Mental Hygiene, Sacramento

***Dr. Horace Lundberg,** Dean, Graduate School of Social Service Administration, Arizona State University, Tempe

Dr. Eugene Mariani, Director of Professional Services, New Mexico Department of Public Welfare, Santa Fe

Judd Marmor, M.D., Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, University of California at Los Angeles

Dr. E. K. Nelson, Professor, University of Southern California School of Public Administration

Dr. Richard A. Pasewark, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Wyoming

Stanley J. Rogers, M.D., Superintendent and Director, Division of Mental Hygiene, Montana State Hospital, Warm Springs

Samuel Schiff, M.D., Chief, Staff Development Department, Ft. Logan Mental Health Center, Fort Logan, Colorado

William Sears, M.D., Las Vegas, New Mexico

Dr. Rex A. Skidmore, Dean, University of Utah School of Social Work, Salt Lake City

***Dr. Charles R. Strother,** Professor of Psychology, University of Washington

John H. Waterman, M.D., Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, University of Oregon; WICHE Field Consultant, GP Programs

*Executive Committee Member

Dr. Robert H. Kroepsch, WICHE Executive Director

Raymond Feldman, M.D., WICHE Associate Director for Regional Programs (Mental Health)

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION SERVICES IN THE WEST

Selected papers from a conference on cooperative agreements, February, 1968, in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Edited by
Dr. Gene Hensley
and
Dorothy P. Buck

This conference was supported in part by The United Cerebral Palsy Research and Education Foundation, Inc., and Rehabilitation Services Administration (formerly Vocational Rehabilitation Administration) grant VRA 546T66.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
University East Campus Boulder, Colorado 80302

June, 1968

FOREWORD

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education has long been interested in problems relating to special education and rehabilitation. WICHE's Special Education and Rehabilitation Program has conducted studies, seminars, and conferences which relate to problems in both of these fields. This project is one of several mental health and related programs which are designed to assist people of the West in cooperating on manpower problems, education, and research.

Programs of special education and rehabilitation have expanded during the last few years. Numerous changes have occurred in services and in the preparation of professional personnel. There has been an increase in the frequency and variety of professional contacts which regularly occur among special education and rehabilitation personnel in schools, agencies, and institutions, and there continues to be a need for increased understanding of respective roles and responsibilities.

The conference which produced these proceedings was concerned with cooperative agreements between special education and rehabilitation services and was one of a series of efforts to encourage the development of cooperative relationships at all levels. It is hoped that the papers contained herein will assist others in giving further attention to the importance of cooperative agreements in providing services to handicapped children and adults.

Acknowledgements are due Floyd Baribeau, James Bradshaw, L. Wayne Campbell, Dorothy Carr, Edward Chouinard, William Findley, Daniel McAlees, James Marshall, and Ernest Willenberg for their excellent presentations, and to all conference participants for their outstanding contributions.

Gene Hensley, Ph.D., Director
Special Education and Rehabilitation
Programs
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

Boulder, Colorado
June, 1968

CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Cooperative Agreements Between Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation 1
Edward L. Chouinard

Special Education and Cooperative Agreements 9
James E. Marshall

Education - Habilitation—a Joint Effort 19
L. Wayne Campbell

Vocational Training for the Educable Mentally Retarded: a Practical Economic Venture 25
Dr. W. L. Findley

Communication Problems in Work-Study Programs 29
James A. Bradshaw

Conference Summary 33
Dr. Daniel McAlees

Participants 38

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Edward L. Chouinard

Acting Regional Assistant Commissioner
Rehabilitation Services Administration
San Francisco, California

Since Dan McAlees called me in December to invite me to this conference, I have thought many times about the experiences I have had during the past five or six years relating to cooperative agreements between vocational rehabilitation and other agencies.

I remember well, when the first time some people came to me about a proposed school-vocational rehabilitation program, how completely inadequate I felt in thinking through the legal and technical complexities of a third-party funded program. Even now—several years later—with each new proposal for a joint program, I find problems or angles which are new to me.

But now that the states in Region IX have jointly-funded programs in operation linking vocational rehabilitation with many fields in addition to special education, such as mental health, corrections, mental retardation, and alcoholism, we can go into these activities with much more assurance.

Advantages of Cooperative Agreements

When two agencies come together to plan a cooperative agreement, they are doing so because each of them feels that the services toward a common end can be improved. In vocational rehabilitation we like to think that our program lends itself to working with special education and its handicapped students. I am sure that schools must want rehabilitation counseling, evaluation, placement, and other services—otherwise they would not be interested in a cooperative arrangement. Likewise, vocational rehabilitation would like to have students receive better preparation for work while still in school.

Traditionally, there has always been a strong alliance between education and vocational rehabilitation. In many states the vocational rehabilitation program is still administered in the Department of Education. A cooperative agreement at the national level entered into by the respective commissioners of education and vocational rehabilitation sets forth the basis for cooperative programs.

In addition to these special ties, because of its emphasis on an individualized approach, vocational rehabilitation ties in well with the special needs of the student. It offers services which, together with the special education program, add up to a more complete program. Alone, each program is incomplete in many areas of the handicapped boy's or girl's needs; together they complement each other. A most important point is that

contact with the student at an early age can be invaluable for his vocational rehabilitation.

The vocational rehabilitation program can be adjusted to suit the school schedule, and in many instances the rehabilitation counselor and other staff can be stationed at the school. Thus the vocational rehabilitation services can be timed to fit the daily schedule of the students. The counselor and the teacher and other school staff can work together on rehabilitation activities such as work experience, on-the-job training in the community, workshop training, etc.

Adjustments in the student's special education program can be made to make it more meaningful for preparation for work. The on-campus work station activity of the school can become a part of the "Joint Program" —since work experience is inherently a vocational rehabilitation service. If none exists, it can be planned and initiated with the help of vocational rehabilitation staff.

Similarly, an off-campus evaluation and on-the-job training in private employer establishments or workshops can be made a part of the "Joint Program." In addition to the teacher, other school personnel can be brought into the program: the school nurse, school physician, psychologist, and work experience coordinator. Needed personnel can be added to the program: vocational evaluators, job developers, and others.

Actually, programs may be set up in a number of ways. New training programs can be established. Workshop services may be introduced into resources. Physical facilities may be arranged on the campus as a focal point for comprehensive services. Both schools and vocational rehabilitation agencies are accustomed to having "Cooperative Agreements" to spell out what purposes the joint activity is designed to serve:

—What services or duties each will perform.

—Who will perform them.

—How records will be kept and results evaluated.

The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has many such agreements with sister agencies.

Unfortunately, as we all well know, often such agreements contain many high-sounding principles but, because the two parties do not bother to change their ways of doing things, the documents are not worth much. On the other hand, if the parties really decide to put their minds to the task of helping handicapped youth in school, much can be done. The important thing is not the piece of paper, but the dedication of each participant to, first, bringing the program into existence and, second, making it work. Several variations are available for setting up cooperative vocational rehabilitation-school arrangements. Special education programs may, and often do, develop work experience programs—usually on-campus, but often off-campus as well—headed by a work experience coordinator. State vocational rehabilitation programs can be linked effectively with these school vocational preparation efforts.

The Agreement: A Contract

However, apparently a major reason for this meeting is to discuss the so-called "third-party" agreement and program. Many of you are familiar with this type of arrangement in which the school's funds are recognized for federal matching purposes. The "third-party" agreement has become very popular during the past few years for a number of reasons:

—School administrators want it (even if it meant giving up some control).

—Additional federal vocational rehabilitation funds were made available to states and conversely state appropriations continued to be hard to get.

—Minimum age limits in vocational rehabilitation programs were lowered and then finally, in 1965, removed entirely.

—At the same time the number of special education classes increased and the "dropout" phenomenon grew.

This form of agreement—sometimes called a "Joint Program" agreement—is a compact between two parties which literally contains not only program matters but also budget agreements. It becomes, in effect if not fact, a contract. The third-party arrangement has many advantages, but from the standpoint of the state-federal system of services it has one major disadvantage.

Disadvantages of Third-Party Arrangements

Because the matching funds which earn the federal funds come from the school budget, the state agency then is dependent upon this source of money. If large amounts of support come from schools and other "third-party" partners, state legislatures may be tempted to hold appropriations down, or even to reduce them. Freedom to conduct a well-balanced program serving all handicapped persons may then be threatened.

To the state administrator who is unsuccessful in obtaining adequate appropriations from the legislature, the temptation is a luring one to seek out more "third-party" funds, sometimes, I am sorry to say, with unfortunate consequences.

Disadvantages to the school administrator are present, too. To meet requirements, school staff members must be turned over to be directed in their vocational rehabilitation work by state vocational rehabilitation agency staff personnel. Budgets must be worked out and school records submitted to state and federal audits. Another federal program is added to the growing list.

Despite any difficulties, however, the trend in this type of pooling of staff and resources is upward. It is upward even though the complexity of the task of developing a third-party agreement and, afterward, seeing that it is conducted properly is perhaps greater than in any other administrative arrangement in the vocational rehabilitation program.

Concepts of Program

Basic to an understanding of what goes into a "third-party" agreement are some concepts of the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program. Most of the problems that come up in working out an agreement stem from these requirements:

—The state agency must be the *sole* state agency.

—It cannot administer and provide services which legally belong to another program.

—(This latter point is one which usually causes the greatest amount of difficulty and the most reorientation of thinking in planning an agreement.)

—The state agency must administer and control the vocational rehabilitation program.

—Establishes eligibility.

—Determines the services—individual rehabilitation plan.

—Controls expenditures for services.

—Approves selection of personnel.

—Supervises all personnel engaged in the vocational rehabilitation program.

The "third-party" agreement should:

—Describe the need for the program and its objectives.

—Specify the responsibilities of the two partners.

—Delineate for each partner the services it will provide to the students.

—Make clear that the program is new and different.

—Describe the duties of personnel assigned to the joint program for school personnel, show how different from previous school duties.

—Show the source of the nonfederal public funds being made available for the joint program.

—Attach a budget showing the uses of the nonfederal and the federal vocational rehabilitation funds which will finance the activities and the services.

This is not intended to be an all-inclusive guide to what goes into an agreement. For that you would need to go to the official issuances on the subject. An outline of material that the Rehabilitation Services Administration believes should be included in a "third party" agreement follows.

APPENDIX A

State Funds for Matching Grants Under Section 2 and Section 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act

JOINT PROGRAM OF THE .....
State vocational rehabilitation agency

AND THE .....
name of third party.

A. *Purpose of program and objectives*

B. *Need for program*
Include description of disability groups involved, numbers in need of program and numbers to be served.

C. *Services to be provided*
Specify services presently provided by each agency and describe what services each agency will provide.

D. *Functions and responsibilities of each agency under the program*

1. Describe the responsibility for administration of the program and the lines of supervisory and administrative authority. Indicate clearly the organizational unit or position in the State vocational rehabilitation agency with primary responsibilities for this program. Indicate any delegation of authority by the State vocational rehabilitation agency to positions included in the joint program.
2. Indicate that all decisions affecting the eligibility of clients, the determination of the rehabilitation potential, and the nature and scope of vocational rehabilitation services to be provided will be made by the State vocational rehabilitation agency and that this responsibility will not be delegated to any other agency or individual. (Section 401.5(e) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Regulations.)
3. Describe briefly the duties and responsibilities of the professional personnel in each agency who will be engaged in the joint program. If personnel in the third party agency are not assigned full time to the joint program, describe the duties and responsibilities of such personnel both in the joint program and in the other programs in which they are engaged. In such instances describe also the method to be used in ascertaining the time devoted by such personnel to the joint program.

E. *Personnel*

1. Indicate that personnel of the third party assigned to the joint program are subject to the same or equivalent qualification standards and tenure standards which are applicable to all employees of the State vocational rehabilitation agency.
2. Indicate that personnel selection in the joint program is subject to the approval of the State vocational rehabilitation agency.

3. Indicate that separation of personnel by the third party agency is subject to approval of the State vocational rehabilitation agency.

4. Indicate that when engaged in vocational rehabilitation work, all personnel in the joint program shall be under the supervision and direction of the vocational rehabilitation agency except as noted below in item 5.

5. If the joint program is located on the premises of the third party agency, specify any control over personnel exercised by the third party agency such as hours when the office or facility is open, and such other housekeeping and administrative procedures are as pertinent

F. *Space, equipment and other items*

1. Describe the facilities to be used for the joint program, in terms of location, available space, arrangements for financing the cost of this space and maintaining it and an assurance that adequate space will continue to be available to the joint program.

2. Equipment and other items needed to carry out the purpose of the joint program should be described in relation to procurement, maintenance, control, use and ultimate disposition in the event it ceases to be of value in carrying out the purposes of the joint program. Indicate that ownership of equipment purchased is in the State vocational rehabilitation agency; if not explain.

G. *Records and reports*

1. Indicate what statistical, financial and other records will be maintained by the third party agency, what will be maintained by the State vocational rehabilitation agency and what will be maintained by personnel as part of the joint program.

2. Describe the kinds of statistical, financial and other reports and the frequency with which such reports will be made by personnel engaged in the joint program and by the third party agency to the State vocational rehabilitation agency. Indicate the clearances involved.

H. *Civil Rights*

Indicate that the third party agency will comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I. *Financial provisions*

1. Indicate the sources of non-Federal public funds being made available for the joint program and specify any restrictions on their use. Describe the procedures by which they are made available to the State vocational rehabilitation agency.

2. Attach a budget showing the amount of non-Federal public funds available for the period involved and the amount of Federal funds to be requested. Describe the activities and services for which the funds will be expended.

3. Indicate that all expenditures for handicapped individuals accepted for determination of the rehabilitation potential will be made in accordance with the extended evaluation plan for the handicapped individual approved by the State vocational rehabilitation agency and that all expenditures for eligible clients will be made in accordance with the vocational rehabilitation plan for the individual approved by the State vocational rehabilitation agency.

4. Specify who will approve extended evaluation plans and vocational rehabilitation plans for handicapped individuals.

5. Specify who will authorize expenditures under such plans.

J. *Legal authority and clearance*

Cite the legal authority for the joint program and indicate any clearances by State officials.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

James E. Marshall

State Director, Division of Special Education
Topeka, Kansas

As quoted in part in a statement of philosophy issued by the Illinois Vocational Services Committee:

> . . . social forces and community pressures are constantly interacting to such a degree that a marriage of educational and rehabilitation services is literally being forced into existence, regardless of the presence or absence of administrative programming.[1]

The need for additional cooperation between rehabilitation and special education has recently been accented in a joint circular that was sent from the U.S. Office of Education and signed by education commissioner Harold Howe and Mary E. Switzer, administrator of U.S. Social and Rehabilitation Service. This circular further advanced the need for cooperative planning between these two agencies.

The need for cooperative effort of special education and rehabilitation was earlier accented in the late 50's by the study of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives. Hearings were held at regional cities on a nationwide basis, and these testimonies were printed in 1960 for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Several of you were involved directly or indirectly in these hearings, and a great deal of material was assembled under the professional direction of Drs. Elena Gall and Merle E. Frampton.

Later recommendations included the establishment of a joint office—Special Education and Rehabilitation.

Many valid arguments were advanced, particularly in general educational circles, against such a move for special education. After that time the status and role of vocational rehabilitation continued to overshadow special education at the national level. As the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation became equal to the table of organization rank of the U.S. Office of Education, the visibility of special education began to fade and, according to some, "nearly drowned in the mainstream of education." To get a bit of closure on the visibility of special education at the U.S. office level for this date, all of us in special education and most of this audience are aware that a later U.S. House of Representatives study under the direction of Representative Hugh Carey (N.Y.) was instrumental in initiating legislative action that elevated special education to a *Bureau* status at the U.S. Office of Education level and subsequently reviving—yes, brightening, if you will—the visibility of that office.

Rehabilitation and special education joint study efforts and recommendations can be also seen in the 1962 publication, *A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation*. Although this report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation obviously was focused on retardation, some of the recommendations are sufficiently generalized to cut across all lines of exceptionality. The section on *Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Training* was sufficiently specific to offer guidelines for action to implement cooperative programs in rehabilitation and special education in the area of mental retardation. Other areas of exceptionality, however, seem to lag in such cooperative efforts.

Cooperative Plans

Again citing the Illinois *Guideline for Cooperative Vocational Services*, their philosophical statement includes:

> Informal cooperative plans have been developed through experimentation on a voluntary basis, but to secure meaningful service programs throughout the State, it is necessary to have both a well planned community special education program at the secondary level and a statewide structured approach with formal agreements between the State departments (Special Education and Rehabilitation) and local school districts.[2]

The various cooperative agreements in special education and rehabilitation vary considerably from state to state. The best single summation of the cooperative agreements that I have read was written by Lyndall Williamson of the University of Wisconsin. I understand that Columbia University Teacher's College in New York City also made a similar study under the direction of Dr. William Younie.

Although I cannot agree with some of Mr. Williamson's conclusions concerning cooperative plans and school work programs, I do commend him for an excellent presentation. Mr. Williamson summarizes the absence of formalized special education and rehabilitation plans as follows:[3]

No Reply	*No Plan*		*Program, But No Agreement*
Massachusetts	Delaware	Nevada	Ohio
	Dist. of Col.	New Mexico	
Vermont	Hawaii	New York	Virginia
	Kansas	North Dakota	
West Virginia	Kentucky	Rhode Island	
	Louisiana	Wyoming	
	Montana		

In all fairness to the states who did not reply or who had no formal plan, no attempt will be made here to analyze where there are on-going programs or not. Many of these same states have work-study programs, financed through state sources or from other federal sources, including vocational education.

At this point I shall present further information from Mr. Williamson's report, not to consider it for a critique, but rather to accept it as factual data and to offer it as a reference point for further considerations.

Noting directly the summaries of typical agreements of special education, rehabilitation, and school districts, I present the following information from the University of Wisconsin study:[4]

A Typical Agreement

A typical agreement generally looks like the following:

A. *Special Education* (state level) agrees:

1. To provide technical consultation as may be needed through state staff personnel.
2. To determine and certify to the Vocational Rehabilitation Division that the (*name of position—differs by state*) meets the minimum *standard* established cooperatively by the Special Education Division and Vocational Rehabilitation Division for such position.
3. To approve the establishment of the special facility (or unit).
4. To perform the other duties and functions assigned, and carry out the program as described in the attached plan.

B. *Vocational Rehabilitation* (state level) agrees:

1. To assign, with the concurrence of the local school administrator, a rehabilitation counselor for each special rehabilitation unit, who will perform the functions described in the attached plan.
2. To approve the plan of operation. Such approval will be based on a determination that the school district meets minimum standards as related to personnel, facilities, and program objectives.
3. To approve the nature and scope of services to be provided by the facility, as distinguished from training courses and other services which are included in the school curriculum. (As required by Section 401.56 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Regulations.)
4. To determine the eligibility of all clients receiving vocational rehabilitation services as described in the attached plan.
5. To authorize all vocational rehabilitation expenditures.
6 To approve all individual vocational rehabilitation plans.
7. To accept referral of those physically and mentally retarded individuals who need and are eligible for vocational rehabilitation services over and above those provided by the independent school district, and to provide necessary services in accordance with provisions of the State Plan for Vocational Rehabilitation.
8. To provide administrative direction and technical consultative services as may be needed under the immediate supervision of the District

Vocational Rehabilitation Supervisor and in accordance with the policies and instructions issued by the State Office of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

9. To develop a budget for operation of the facility (unit).
10. To perform other duties and functions assigned and carry out the program as described in the attached plan.
11. The staff of the facility will be included in the staff development programs planned by the division for its personnel.

C. *School District* agrees:

1. To establish the special facility (unit) as described in the attached plan.
2. To administer the special education program as distinguisned from the vocational rehabilitation services of the facility.
3. To provide the required space, maintenance of building, necessary utilities, custodial help, etc.
4. To designate a (*name of position—differs by state*) with the concurrence of the directors of vocational rehabilitation and special education, who will be in charge of the vocational rehabilitation facility established to provide rehabilitation services. He (or she) and the facility staff will work closely with the local district supervisor and follow the policies established by the division's state plan. The unit will be considered as an extension of the state program administered in the local district.
5. To prepare and submit an annual budget, and maintain appropriate accounts and records and make such reports as may from time to time be reasonably required.
6. To provide access to school records and school evaluations.
7. To coordinate existing services within the school with the special rehabilitation program provided by the facility.
8. To perform such other duties and functions as will extend and improve the rehabilitation program provided through the facility within the secondary school as prescribed in the attached plan.

The agreement may be terminated by any of the parties hereto on 30 days notice, and amended or changed by mutual consent of all parties concerned, if in accordance with appropriate laws, rules, and regulations, state or federal.

This agreement shall become effective upon its signing by the duly authorized representative of the parties hereto.

Signatories to this agreement also indicate compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the provisions therein.

Education as a State Function

I should like to present some basic considerations that apply directly or indirectly to cooperative agreements between rehabilitation and special education. First I would like for us to consider special education as a function of the state and that supervision of education programs, in the final analysis, is the function of the state educational agency. My concern then is that the State Department of Education and particularly the special education division or section of that state must be a part of the cooperative agreements. In a few states, I believe, the state education agency has not been a part of the formalized agreement. By this very omission the responsibility of the state educational agency is violated as it has long had the responsibility delegated to it by our constitutional forefathers.

A Total Program for the Handicapped

The second basic consideration in cooperative agreements is a plan that includes all handicapped children and youth. All cooperative agreements between rehabilitation and special education should consider all phases of handicapping conditions and not be directed toward the mentally retarded alone. There seems to be a dearth of rehabilitation programs that can be identified with the emotionally disturbed children and the socially maladjusted. Under the socially maladjusted programs should be included programs for wed and unwed and pregnant youth. Their rehabilitation programming seems to have been slighted or given only token consideration. In special education and rehabilitation hearings, legislative hearings (1960 and 1966), many testimonies pointed out the need for additional cooperative services for the emotionally disturbed, crippled, and multi-handicapped, as well as the mentally retarded.

Insurance of Adequate Training

It is particularly relevant that these cooperative agreements include insurance and standards that both the special education representatives and the rehabilitation representatives have sufficient training to carry out their respective roles in an acceptable manner. For some years State Departments of Education have worked to upgrade the standards of teacher training in the various categorical areas. Some states still have minimal requirements, however.

A recent publication prepared by Dr. Romaine Mackie and her associates entitled *College and University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children* (1968) updates her earlier U.S.O.E. publication of 1954. The study reports the dramatic increase of training programs for teachers of the handicapped. In fact, according to this comprehensive study, there is an increase of about 80 percent over the 1953-54 study in the number of institutions with programs. Most of the increase since 1954, it was pointed out, was in colleges and universities that did not have a program. Later documentation, including the recent hearings and studies on the availability of trained teachers in special education, would indicate there is still an acute shortage in spite of the fact that many more colleges and universities are entering the field of professional preparation.

As cited in the section "Manning Programs of Vocational Rehabilitation" in *A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation*:

> Perhaps the most severe limiting factor on our capacity to mount a rapid expansion of effective rehabilitation and training programs is the shortage of specialists. The training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation established in 1954 supports the preparation of personnel in the various professions related to rehabilitation. It provides teaching grants and traineeships in fields where shortages of qualified personnel are great and, in addition, sponsors short-term seminars designed to update training and orient professional personnel to the philosophy and practice of rehabilitation.[5]

This generalized statement did not appear to be aimed at mental retardation alone, but across the board for all handicaps.

The report also states that most vocational rehabilitation agencies do not have sufficient staff to meet long-standing obligations in all areas of handicaps. Further, it states that few agencies employ rehabilitation personnel with particular skills and competencies in the field of mental retardation. Also, if greater leadership is to be developed for services for the retarded, it is essential that specialists in mental retardation be recruited and skills of existing staffs augmented. Such would be the case for other areas of the handicapped.

It is not my purpose here to recommend an optimal training program for both (or either) the special educator or the rehabilitation specialist. It is to call attention to the importance of understanding handicaps whether from a rehabilitation point of view or from a special education point of view and relate these understandings in terms of a supportive program for the individual youth involved.

Just as there are untrained special education teachers (who usually rely on a very academic approach) there are, I assume, untrained rehabilitation specialists. In one state I know that a rehabilitation placement officer can qualify for that position with a bachelor's degree in direct or related areas. These related areas might be psychology, sociology, guidance, and the like, but no specific training for the handicapped.

One city director of special education stated it well when he said that both special education teachers and the rehabilitation specialists must understand their respective fields as related to a given exceptionality. They are more than technicians, more than trainees—they are both public relation specialists. Shallow, inadequate backgrounds of training will surface in the inability to communicate the nature of the program to employers, parents, and fellow workers—much less display inappropriate procedures in the training program for the youth.

The agreement, then, should demand that sound standards of special education and rehabilitation training be insured.

Program Supervision

Present rehabilitation guidelines and regulations have taken away

authority delegated to local school special education administrators. If a cooperative program of special education and rehabilitation is set up, it is a continuation of that school's curriculum in that area. It should be the total supervisory responsibility of that school system and not a part-time venture which is later assumed by another agency. Some states have displayed discontent with this type of arrangement; many are satisfied.

Local directors and supervisors of special education were contacted in our state (Kansas) concerning their viewpoints on cooperative programs of vocational rehabilitation and special education and in particular the role of local schools in the supervision of them. Unanimously, and independently, these directors concluded that cooperative programs must be directly supervised by those in charge of special education programs. Such a survey with rehabilitation specialists would have undoubtedly revealed different results.

The point at hand is that if this is an extension of the local school's education program, it is their responsibility for supervision. The state agencies, both special education and rehabilitation, should set broad policies, procedures, and standards of program operation. State consultation and supervision are in order. The details of local supervision, hiring of personnel, and program operation are the rightful responsibility of local schools if this cooperative program is a part of the school curriculum. Federal guidelines and regulations can be changed if there is sufficient evidence and reason to do so.

Full-Time Cooperative Specialists

As a final agreement consideration, I would like to propose, at great personal risk, the abolishment of third-party financing and its correlative, the "split-half" specialist. I base this consideration on the following:

1. The secondary special education teacher displays expertise in the teaching field. The teacher does not usually have the necessary rehabilitation skills to function in the rehabilitation area.

2. A half-day teaching arrangement assumes that all youth enrolled in that given program are ready for in-school or out-of-school work-study programs. Should the student not be ready, he is probably "integrated" into a regular class without the supportive help of the special class teacher. He may even be excluded from school during this time in some cases. The special education teaching job is a full-time one.

3. The rehabilitation specialist also is required to display expertise in his field. Should there be a limited number of youth in a given special education program, then his/her time could well be spent with other groups of handicapped youth within that school district or even on a cooperative basis with other schools. The rehabilitation adjustment counselor's job is also a full-time position.

4. Third-party financing poses legal problems involving attendance and finances as related to half-day programs. These problems are as follows:

If the youth is enrolled one-half day in a school program and enrolled one-half day in a program not under the direct supervision of the school, is he meeting the compulsory school requirements of the state?

If the enrollment is half-time, is the school foundation money (general school aid) affected in terms of enrollment?

If the special education program was approved as a full unit, but yet only one-half time under the supervision of the school, is the program eligible for one-half of the special education reimbursement or should it be fully reimbursed?

An additional financial consideration is one of ethics. Is "matching in kind" really an appropriate method of matching dollars—or is it just a means of acquiring "free" federal money without really adding state or local investment? The strict matching of federal dollars is most generous in favor of the local and state programs.

I am sure that not all problems and procedures of cooperative agreements in special education and rehabilitation will be solved here at this workshop. Special education and rehabilitation will need to involve other agencies in their cooperative agreements. If these programs are truly extensions of a local school curriculum, then the immediate and direct supervision should be the responsibility of that local school. As we sometimes appear threatened by an agency or individual's role, I am reminded of a quotation from Dietrich Bonhoffer, a theological great of this century, who stated in one of his books, *Life Together,* "Decisions which our work demands will be simpler and easier when they are made, not in the fear of men, but solely in the presence of God."

Our impatience to move mountains and to overlook accumulations of accomplishment is brought out in a writing by Helen Keller, special education's most celebrated multi-handicapped individual. (Parenthetically, I might add that she did not have the advantage of cooperative agreements between special education and rehabilitation.) Miss Keller's "Humble Tasks" offers a sage theme for our consideration:

> I long to accomplish a great and noble task, but my chief duty is to accomplish humble tasks as if they were great and noble. The world is moved along, not only by the mighty shoves of its heroes, but also by the aggregate of the tiny pushes of each honest worker.

May our honest workings here at this conference help in some small way to move along a better world for handicapped youth.

---

[1]Rt. Rev. Msgr. Gill Middleton, Dr. Harold R. Phelps, and Naomi Hiett. *A Guideline for Cooperative Vocational Services for Handicapped Youth at the High School Level.* Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Vocational Services Committee, Illinois Committee on Children, 1965.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]Lyndall C. Williamson. *Nationwide Categorized Variables of State Agreements/Plans/Guidelines in the Current School Work Program Concept.* Madison, Wis.: The University of Wisconsin, 1967.

[4]*Ibid.*

[5]President's Panel on Mental Retardation. *A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October, 1962.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Ad Hoc Subcommittee Testimonies. *Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Education and Labor Committee*, Washington, D. C.: U.S. House of Representatives, August, 1966.

Mackie, Romaine P., Hunter, Patricia P., and Neuber, Margaret A. *College and University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children.* Washington, D. C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1968.

Middleton, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Gill, Phelps, Dr. Harold R., and Hiett, Naomi. *A Guideline for Cooperative Vocational Services for Handicapped Youth at the High School Level.* Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Vocational Services Committee, Illinois Committee on Children, 1965.

President's Panel on Mental Retardation. *A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation.* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, October, 1962.

Public Law 565, U.S. Congress, 1954.

Public Law 89-333, U.S. Congress, 1965.

Subcommittee on Special Education. *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Special Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives*, Eighty-Sixth Congress Second Session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Williamson, Lyndall C. *Nationwide Categorized Variables of State Agreements/Plans/Guidelines in the Current School Work Program Concept.* Madison, Wis.: The University of Wisconsin, December, 1967.

EDUCATION-HABILITATION—A JOINT EFFORT

L. Wayne Campbell

Curriculum Specialist in Education of Mentally Retarded Children
California State Department of Education

The California Mandate of 1947

California has been providing services for mentally retarded minors within the structure of the public school framework for many years. Prior to 1947, there were approximately 6,000 educable mentally retarded minors enrolled in these programs throughout California. In 1947, the California Legislature mandated the public schools to provide these programs within school districts of over 900 ADA. County superintendents of schools were mandated to provide education for these minors residing in school districts of less than 900 ADA.

Since that time, we have had phenomenal growth in the programs for the mentally retarded in all communities throughout California. Primarily this growth is based upon the identification of eligible minors already residing in the schools. As identification programs expanded, additional minors were placed in the school programs and better identification procedures and techniques were developed.

The problem of providing teachers especially trained to teach the minors also soon was recognized. Programs began to develop to prepare teachers to accept this responsibility. The legislature also recognized the responsibility to provide additional funding for these classes and began a pattern of excess cost reimbursement to the districts in 1952.

The Key Years for Expansion

Many laws were passed regarding the expansion, refinement, and support of these programs during the next decade. Most of the program offerings occurred at the elementary level. People involved in special education shall remember the years of 1960 through 1966 as being the key years for the expansion of all areas of special education.

There have been many influences that have brought about social change regarding the handicapped—not only within the larger community but also within the public school structure. One of the most significant concerning programs for the mentally retarded was the formation of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. The president reflected his concern over the problems of mental retardation by the formation of this panel. He charged them with the responsibility of making a complete study of the services and programs available for mentally retarded individuals throughout the nation. All persons involved in special education are aware of the significant contributions made by this group.

After years of involvement and detailed study, the panel made their report to Congress and to President Kennedy. As a result of their efforts, in October, 1963, President Kennedy signed the Mental Retardation Bill. Encompassing this bill was a significant expansion of federally funded services for mentally retarded. It also contained strong suggestions for each state to set up parallel study commissions to evaluate the problems of mental retardation at the state level.

California, recognizing the implications of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, took measures to follow the recommendation of this panel and formulated, in 1963, a California Study Commission on Mental Retardation. The commission accomplished a tremendous task by appraising the problem of services to the mentally retarded throughout California.

At the same time, the Assembly Education Committee of the California Legislature set forth a Special Education Sub-committee to appraise the problems of special education in the public schools. Both the California Study Commission and the Special Education Sub-committee of the California Education Committee sent teams of individuals throughout the state to appraise the public school programs.

The California Study Commission prepared an elaborate report to the legislature, presented in 1965. As a result, a significant amount of legislation was introduced, passed, and signed into law which provided a broad-base foundation for total services to mentally retarded individuals.

Laws were recommended and passed that would not only increase and enhance public school offerings but also provide support for community action. The 1965 session of the California Legislature mandated programs for the trainable mentally retarded within public schools, established the principle of community cooperation in developing and implementing total programs for the mentally retarded, and established a coordinator of services for the mentally retarded at the executive level of government. These are but a few of the significant legislative enactments during 1965. As a result, cooperative programs between the State Department of Education, the California public schools, and the Department of Rehabilitation moved toward becoming reality.

California's Program Today

Today California has 27 cooperative programs between public schools and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation involving 33 school districts and county superintendents of schools. They enroll (the participating districts and county superintendents of schools) 16 percent of the educable mentally retarded minors currently enrolled in public school programs.

A state advisory committee on programs for mentally retarded minors enrolled in California public schools was appointed by the superintendent of public instruction pursuant to Assembly Bill 451. This bill directed the superintendent of public instruction to establish an advisory committee and to develop general guidelines for courses of study for mentally retarded minors throughout California.

The legislature, the state board of education and the advisory committee strongly accepted the principle that education and rehabilitation for life must be a joint responsibility of the public schools, vocational rehabilitation, the department of mental hygiene, the department of employment, and other agencies providing services for the mentally retarded. They encouraged, by act and by implementation, the cooperation of all public and private agencies in the development of the total program which would prepare mentally retarded minors to become productive participating members of society.

This was a tremendous challenge to all the population of California. However, it has extraordinary implications. Testimony provided to the California Legislature clearly indicated that, if mentally retarded individuals were provided with appropriate training during their high school years, they could be placed into the world of work and become productive. Testimony also indicated that, without this training, mentally retarded minors became infeasible for vocational rehabilitation attempts in that they not only had to overcome the difficulty of mental retardation but in addition they had social problems, emotional problems, and another handicap referred to as deprivation that prevented or at least significantly impaired their potential of being rehabilitated toward productivity.

As a result of all the studies, the testimony, the concern of major citizens, and the strength of the legislature, several studies were started to provide basic information on planning for these retarded minors. One of the studies entitled *Work-Study Programs: A Socioeconomic Must* provided significant information on the potential loss to the citizens of California if a more objective approach to the training of the mentally retarded was not adopted.

The Department of Rehabilitation also began to expand the organization to include direct cooperative programs with public schools. Frank Hart, who has recently retired from this department, initially started establishing the foundations and framework for the development of this program. The legislature passed several laws to permit cooperative agreements. Phil Ladas was appointed to serve as supervisor for the cooperative programs at the state level of organization within the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Our initial contract with public schools in California began with the San Juan Unified School District in Sacramento. Additional school districts became interested and solicited the cooperation of vocational rehabilitation in developing cooperative programs in their particular district. The amount of money that could be invested in this program was limited by the California Legislature.

At the present time, we are maximally utilizing all of the funds provided by the California Legislature for cooperative programs. With this maximum utilization, there is only sufficient money to provide services for 16 percent of those enrolled in public school programs at the secondary level. This clearly indicates that the public schools are going to have to become more directly involved in the education habilitation process. We cannot depend totally upon vocational rehabilitation to do all of the job.

The cooperative relationship between the public schools, the State Department of Education, and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation will have to be evaluated as to the best method of providing habilitation services to all those children enrolled in California secondary schools.

The state advisory committee also made recommendations to the California State Board of Education regarding the guidelines for the development of curriculum and the course of study to be used by public schools. These guidelines were adopted March 9, 1967, to become effective September 1, 1967. They clearly indicated that public schools shall provide work training programs and job placements for mentally retarded minors at the high school level. They identified a new term called "work-study" to be applied to the program for the mentally retarded.

This was a significant departure from the work experience aspect that had been in public schools for some time. The concept involved in work experience provided that the actual work experience was a peripheral part of the educational program, and there were rules and regulations regarding the operation of this particular program that separated it from the regular instructional program for regular children.

The idea of the California advisory committee was that the work training aspect should be an integral part of the instructional program and that the teacher at the secondary level should be a key member of the education habilitation team. Therefore, the terminology "work-study" separated the program for the mentally retarded from the traditional restricted work experience program and established flexibility within the operation of the program that would permit the individualization of the training program for mentally retarded based on their needs and identified by the education habilitation staff.

The California Legislature requested that a report be provided to the legislature on the progress of this particular program on January 1, 1968. The Department of Vocational Rehabilitation research and statistics division and the Department of Education cooperatively made significant efforts at providing an evaluation of the cooperative programs to the legislature in January. The preliminary forms have been summarized and some data are now available in a *Preliminary Report of California's Rehabilitation Cooperative School Program* regarding the operation of the program throughout California.

This report points out that, in the academic year 1966-67, there were 13,820 educable mentally retarded minors enrolled in secondary programs (grades 9-12) in California public schools. Of this number, 16 percent were enrolled in school districts having cooperative agreements with the Department of Rehabilitation. There were 817 students being served in the cooperative program from districts supplying data for this preliminary report. In the academic year 1967-68, there are 14,496 educable mentally retarded minors enrolled. In addition, the following trends were noted:

1. Educable mentally retarded high school students are remaining in school longer, thus indicating a possible reduced drop-out rate.

2. Cooperation between vocational rehabilitation staff and school staff has influenced the curriculum toward more vocational preparation.
3. Significant gains in the location of on-campus work training stations, in different types of training stations, and placements on training stations.
4. Significant gains in off-campus training stations.
5. Significant increase in placement after completing the last year of high school.
6. Emphasis has been on educable mentally retarded. Physically handicapped and educationally handicapped are not receiving as many services as yet.
7. Some districts are beginning to employ graduates of this program.

With the assistance of the California Advisory Committee on Programs for the Mentally Retarded, the State Department of Education continued to develop long-range goals and objectives and to effect organization and structure whereby the intent of the California Legislature and the State Board of Education could be carried out regarding the education habilitation programs for mentally retarded minors enrolled in public schools.

The years 1967 and through 1969 were identified as years in which significant effort would be expended in developing, expanding, and refining secondary programs directed toward work-study offerings for all secondary minors. Literally thousands of people throughout the state involved in special education began to work on the development of county and local district curricula for the mentally retarded. This in itself was a significant contribution to refining the programs for the mentally retarded. The year 1968 was specifically designated as the year for action.

In addition, 1968 was identified as the in-service year in which secondary school administrators, secondary teachers, and directors of special education would be involved in significant in-service training directed toward more adequate preparation of the mentally retarded in vocational achievements. These goals have been partially attained to date.

Another goal set forth for 1968 was a direct effort to expand the federal civil service offerings for mentally handicapped individuals through vocational rehabilitation. It was also decided that we should approach the California state personnel board and to make every effort possible to parallel the federal program within state civil service. As a result of these efforts, a vocational rehabilitation counselor has been placed on the staff of the state personnel board to assist in the development of procedures, rules, regulations, and policies in developing a state civil service program parallel to that at the federal level.

In subsequent years we will move from the state level into the county civil service structure and from there to the city. One of our long-range goals in California is to parallel civil service offerings provided in the federal bill on mental retardation for federal civil service into every level of the civil service structure down to the local community.

These efforts, when completed, will provide job opportunities and job training positions for thousands of mentally handicapped individuals in the state of California alone. No longer can educators or rehabilitation counselors bury their heads in the sands of the lack of potential services available. Each must contribute cooperatively to providing more realistic approaches to the placement of mentally retarded minors.

The traditional approach of vocational rehabilitation as it relates to feasibility must be carefully examined. The traditional approaches of the public schools regarding the academic ability of these minors also must be carefully examined. There are many problems that must be jointly pursued and researched and intelligent answers ascertained.

Mentally Retarded Individuals Shall Be Helped

This is a challenge that has been set forth to both the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and to the public schools. Statistics have clearly indicated the price of failure. The citizens of California cannot afford to pay this price. Research and statistics have also clearly indicated the physical, emotional, social, vocational, and financial benefits of providing a total program for these minors.

It is with the utmost confidence that we are able to reflect the statement set forth by the National Association for Retarded Children that "mentally retarded individuals can be helped" and assist in rephrasing that statement to mentally retarded *shall* be helped. This help will not come without anxieties, without the re-evaluation of concepts, procedures, and approaches. It will not come without the identification and the solution of problems as they appear on the day-to-day basis. However, with a positive attitude and with willing heads and hands and a cooperative effort, these problems shall be solved.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Campbell, L. Wayne. *Work-Study Programs: A Socioeconomic Must.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Bureau for Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Exceptional Children, 1968.

Campbell, L. Wayne. *Preliminary Report of California's Rehabilitation Cooperative School Program.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Bureau for Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Exceptional Children, 1968.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR THE EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED: A PRACTICAL ECONOMIC VENTURE

Dr. W. L. Findley

Supervisor, Special Education
Great Falls Public Schools
Great Falls, Montana

This is an abstract of the author's unpublished Doctor of Education dissertation, "A Follow-Up of the Financial Assets and Liabilities of Mentally Retarded Youth as Related to the Cost of Vocational Training in Four Public School Systems." The study was completed at Colorado State College in 1967. In each of the four public school systems reported on in this study, the local Rehabilitation Services Administration (VRA) agency was involved in the vocational preparation of the students.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the financial investment of public schools in vocational training and the post-school economic status of educable mentally retarded in four communities. Five questions were posed which, when answered, would provide practical information for administrators and school systems planning such programs.

These questions centered around the school costs for vocational preparation, the earning power of the students, the financial contributions of these students to their respective communities, and their earning and tax-paying abilities projected over a period of 10 years. This was to be compared to the initial cost of two years of preparation.

Procedure

By means of interview and questionnaire, data were gathered on 67 of the 105 subjects in four communities: Amarillo, Texas; Big Spring, Texas; Lubbock, Texas; and Greeley, Colorado. Earnings and income taxes were projected over a 10-year period, and these projections were related to the initial cost of their vocational preparation. The data were interpreted in terms of dollars and percentages, and over-all averages. Data from the local agencies for vocational rehabilitation were included.

Communities chosen were Amarillo, Texas, school population of 34,410; Big Spring, Texas, school population, 7,152; Lubbock, Texas, school population, 30,916; and Greeley, Colorado, school population, 8,967. The population for the study consisted of 105 students who had vocational training in these four different school systems. There were 11 in Amarillo, 17 in Big Spring, 40 in Greeley, and 37 in Lubbock. Of the 105 students, employment records were obtainable on 67. Other pertinent information was

available on another 17. This gave a total of 84 subjects on whom data were secured. The study sought to answer five questions. They were:

1. What is the cost per student to each school system for two years of vocational training for the mentally retarded?
2. What earning ability of the students is demonstrated by on-the-job employment records?
3. What financial contributions are the former students making to the economy of their respective communities?
4. To what extent are the former students still a financial liability to their respective communities?
5. How does the earning ability of the student, projected over a 10-year period, compare with the cost of his preparation?

After gathering the data on the prescribed interview forms, the following information was obtained on each question:

Question Number One

The data show that the educational cost per student for a two-year period was $1,016 in Amarillo, $1,774 in Big Spring, $1,200 in Greeley, and $896 in Lubbock. The average was $1,222 for the two-year period. When adding the VRA costs in each individual community to the school cost, the total cost of their tax-supported preparation amounted to $1,514 in Amarillo, $2,194 in Big Spring, $1,360 in Greeley and $1,119 in Lubbock. The average total cost was $1,546.

Question Number Two

After accumulating the data on those who had earning records in each system, it was found that the average individual earning for Amarillo was $2,463; for Big Spring, $1,218; for Lubbock, $1,836; and for Greeley, $1,702. The average individual earning was $1,805.

Question Number Three

The means by which the student spent his money was divided into categories. It was discovered that most of the students spent the largest part of their money for personal living expenses.

Fifty-three percent spent part of their money helping their parents. Forty percent of the students spent money on automobiles and automobile payments. Four percent made investments. Twenty-four percent of the students were buying insurance, mainly automobile insurance. Twenty-two percent spent money on personal property items. Twenty-eight percent could not account for a significant part of their income.

It was also determined that the students were paying a significant amount of income tax. The average individaul income tax in Amarillo amounted to $293 for the past two years; in Big Spring, $128; in Lubbock, $237; and in Greeley, $187, with an over-all average of $211.

Question Number Four

When all the data had been compiled concerning liabilities, it was discovered that there were very few liabilities incurred in the categories within which they were explored. These categories were both felonies and misdemeanors, welfare and indebtedness beyond means, and institutionalization.

The results showed that less than 4 percent of the 67 students had become involved in felonies with the law. Six percent of the cases were still members of families drawing welfare benefits. None were found to have been in debt beyond their means. None were in institutions.

Question Number Five

The accumulated data revealed that the projection of income taxes to be paid as related to individual costs of preparation were as follows: (1) Amarillo students will pay $1,465 in income taxes to be compared with $1,514 costs; (2) Big Spring students will pay on the average $640 taxes compared with $2,194 cost; (3) Greeley students will pay on the average $935 taxes compared with $1,360 cost; and (4) Lubbock students will pay on the average $1,185 compared with $1,119 cost.

Based on the income tax projections, during their employment as a result of training, the students will pay for the cost of their preparation in taxes. They will also make a substantial contribution to the flow of the economy in their community. This amounts to individual returns of $29,333 in Amarillo; $14,012 in Big Spring; $19,750 in Greeley; and $18,716 in Lubbock.

Conclusion

The data gathered by this study supports one basic conclusion: Vocational training for the educable mentally retarded in the public schools is a practical economic venture.

COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS IN WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

James A. Bradshaw

Consultant, Division of Special Education Services
Colorado Department of Education

One of the major problem areas related to the establishment and administration of the work-study program in special education involves communication with understanding. Communication between the work-study team, the community, other teaching professionals, and parents is often-times confused through assumptions, language, and terminology.

Communication that involves learning must consider intellect and a multiplicity of other skills. It may involve intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, and a myriad of other organizational facets. We know that ideas exist at different levels such as logical versus emotional, word meaning-semantics versus individual and groups meanings, and agreement with understanding. Do we assume that everyone is operational and functional at the same level?

Historically, the concept of building a program which bridges schooling and work is not unique to the mentally handicapped. The first school work-study program based on the concept that many items of technical knowledge and personal growth can be secured most economically through actual on-the-job placement was founded at the University of Cincinnati in 1906. The first high school program was founded in the Cincinnati Public Schools in 1907 as a direct result of that experiment at the university. J. Brewer describes the historical development of the work-study program in the Virginia State Department of Education, Special Education Services publication, *Guidelines for Establishing School Work-Study Programs for Educable Mentally Retarded Youth.*

Terminology and Slanguage

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 gave particular emphasis to work-study program planning, and interest in these programs is at a new high. This peak reflects the developments in general education and has tended in the main to follow their growth. Dr. William Younie, Teachers College, Columbia University, pointed out some of the general terminology used in general education to describe the work-study program. We find that many of these same terms are currently being used in the special education work-study programs. Those most commonly used are:

Cooperative education
Occupational experience
Diversified occupations
School work
Work-study
Work-education
Job experience

Work experience
Job study
Job sampling
On-the-job training
Adjustment classes
Life experience
Field work
Closure
Transitional
Core
Prevocational
Vocational
Junior-opportunity
Opportunity

Like the child's game of "gossip" these many terms, in most instances, apply directly or indirectly to work-study programs and its curriculum implications.

The Transitional Process

Although work-study is a terminal program, it must be thought of as being a bridge rather than a terminus. It allows the young adult to participate in the world of work while still receiving the guidance of the school. The full import of this role must be transmitted to the program so that it fosters independence and does not make the student dependent in a different way. Accordingly, the program should be planned so as to help the child accept and profit from the services of post-school professionals. Since the school work-study program is part of a continuous process, it can only be effective if communications are geared in both directions for programs at lower levels. The goals of the school work-study program and a general idea of its structure and function should be known by all teachers at all levels of the continuum.

Some schools prefer to use the same term for the special education program that is used by the general education programs. The rationale for this policy is that similar designation will avoid having a stigma attached to the special education program and its graduates. The use of terminology implies considerable acceptance of the handicapped by the school involved. There is an opposite sentiment which is expressed through the insistence that the work program for the handicapped be called by a term which will eliminate its confusion with the work programs conducted elsewhere in the schools. Whatever terminology is used should be clearly defined to all who are concerned with its use. It should be honest in its description of the program it identifies.

Communication

It is necessary for those of us involved in the special education work-study programs to consider the following aspects in establishing commu-

nication between the work-study team, the community, administration, other teaching professionals, and parents:

1. Selective hearing—people tend to tune in and out, make changes, additions and deletions, for that which is compatible to their own thinking.
2. False assumptions—everyone is not tuned in.
3. Understanding and comprehension.
4. Semantics.
5. Terminology—slanguage.
6. Interpretation.
7. Procrastination—too many wait for the other agencies to make the initial overtures.
8. Power struggle—breakdowns result in determining who will control.
9. Knowledge of individuals or groups with whom you are attempting to establish communication, e.g., urban—rural—ethnic.
10. How well you sell.

When we as professionals in the field can supplant our own egos with the desire to enhance special education and help children through planning, research, advisement, and consultation, then we can be more effective. Who will administer should not be a problem in our communication. Let us not pull the wagon in opposing directions at the same time. Our job is to inspire, stimulate, coordinate, cooperate, and above all, communicate, if work-study programs are to be truly effective.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Dr. Daniel McAlees

Coordinator, Rehabilitation Counselor Training
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado

The future of the handicapped individual depends in a large degree on the scope and quality of educational opportunity and vocational training provided by the educational system involved. At this conference we have recognized the importance of planning toward an effective and comprehensive program between special education and vocational rehabilitation during the transitional period of the child's life from the more formal training of the classroom to work activities in the labor community. The need for these cooperative programs became apparent when many of the special education students we are training were rendered unemployable at age 16 or 18 for lack of vocational skills to become self-sustaining members of society.

The purposes of these cooperative agreements are to establish and to develop a unique complex of rehabilitative services at the prevocational and vocational levels *presently not provided by the public schools.* The services which are traditionally and legally the function of the schools and vocational rehabilitation will not be violated in the operation of these programs. A new and different complex of rehabilitative services will be developed to meet the identified needs of individual clients.

In establishing programs of this type and scope, it is recognized that certain services to the mentally, physically, socially, or emotionally handicapped youth can legally be the responsibility of both special education and DVR. The very nature of the problem and common objectives of these two programs make this so. However, cooperative agreements provide for a continuous and uninterrupted service through these "common areas" without duplication or encroachment of one division on the legal responsibility of the other perhaps better than if the two programs were to operate independently.

The appropriate competencies developed through the secondary curriculum of the local school participating in a cooperative program will show a more proficient, better equipped, and functional individual for placement in the labor community. No one factor can determine the excellence of such a program but, through the combined efforts of the cooperating organizations, a more sophisticated and acceptable client can be released to the society of labor.

The Need for Cooperative Agreements

Some of the weaknesses in special education prevocational services which indicate the need for cooperative agreements include:

1. Inadequate understanding, or misunderstanding, among school personnel of the prevocational needs of the handicapped. As a result, few

opportunities were provided for the handicapped to engage in worthwhile in-school work experiences.

2. Lack of adequate diagnosis of vocational aptitudes and interests of the handicapped—their weaknesses further compounded by lack of personnel trained to translate findings into actual job situations.

3. Lack of a specialist on the special services staff with the training and time to coordinate the prevocational program in the school, to serve as a liaison person between the school and agencies in the community in placing the handicapped on jobs, and to formulate and conduct a follow-up program of the special students after they leave school.

4. Lack of a close working relationship with such agencies as DVR that can share the responsibility for planning the handicapped youths' vocational training and subsequent job placement.

5. Some special education personnel tend to be unrealistic about the vocational and social capacities and opportunities of disabled students.

6. The atmosphere created in the classroom is often highly sheltered and unreal. Students are not given a picture of the world as it really is.

7. Education has tended to stress the academic side of training to the degree that students often fail to acquire the socially acceptable behavior and work habits that they need to function successfully on the job.

8. The students who "graduate" from special education classes have often been unready for entry into the world of work. As a result, a considerable amount of retraining has been required to make them ready during the post-school period.

We have seen a number of approaches to the resolution of the above problem areas. However, we have also seen that there is *no one right way—one best way* to attack this problem. We have certain guidelines, but the *real answer* to the problem lies not in a rigid approach or stereotyped program but rather in flexibility and variability in developing cooperative agreements. The real key to services is in molding a unique and individualized program for each of our unique and individualized situations.

This is not to say, however, that the objectives or goals of the program are undefinable or variable. You have delineated rather specific goals and services which will be common to all cooperative arrangements, no matter how unique in nature.

General Objectives

1. To apply knowledge, new methods, and new techniques in a combined and coordinated program making maximum use of the resources of vocational rehabilitation, the public schools, and related community resources.

2. To extend the services of vocational rehabilitation early in the process of vocational development to an increasing number of clients.

Specific Goals and Services

1. Systematic diagnosis and evaluation of personal-social traits of pupil-clients as they relate to successful work performance.

2. Personal and social adjustment training necessary for successful job preparation, employment, and independent living.

3. Assessment of occupational potential and evaluation of vocational aptitudes of individual pupil-clients.

4. The purchase of specialized diagnosis and evaluation needed and unavailable through the school. These may include medical, psychological, and/or evaluation center services.

5. Provision at secondary school level of a prevocational and adjustment training laboratory in which special education staff and vocational rehabilitation staff pool their efforts in preparing the student for successful employment.

6. Extension of the special education program to job tryouts, on-the-job training, part-time employment, or a full-time job within the framework of the school setting.

7. Vocational counseling, planning, and training in specific areas of employment.

8. Selective job placement and supervision.

Goals such as the above accrue in many advantages to the special education teacher, the vocational rehabilitation counselor, the student, and society. Cooperative agreements make programs of service such as the above more financially feasible for both special education and rehabilitation. Cooperative agreements provide support to the special education teacher in the development of a vocationally oriented curriculum and allow her to better adjust curriculum and make it more meaningful and practical for students. Consequently, the rehabilitation counselor has a better prepared client to work with and more potential for services. Because of the cooperation of the special education teacher and vocational rehabilitation counselor early in his program, the student is better prepared for life and to be a productive member of the world of work. This is of inevitable value to both him and the society in which he lives.

The Essence of the Conference

The essence of the discussion and hence the conference was that we recognized that each of us has something to offer each other. Regardless of legal snarls, complexities, and administrative headaches, we each have certain special skills, knowledge, and service that are vital to the services of a comprehensive program for disabled youth.

Rehabilitation can offer the following:

1. Counseling and guidance—the counselor is experienced in dealing

with most of the social, economic, vocational, educational, and medical problems faced by the students.

2. Job analysis—this function should be of immense value to teachers in preparing a curriculum for the students.

3. Psychological and vocational testing—to supplement where not provided by the school.

4. Job and work-experience training development—the counselor is generally familiar with the employment climate in his community and is experienced in contacting potential trainers and employers. This, in conjunction with his ability to analyze the job and the employer relative to the suitability of the placement, should help to lessen the teacher's load in securing work-experience placements.

5. Training and job supervision—the counselor and the special education teacher together make an ideal supervisory team. The counselor is familiar with employers and their problems and can be of real value in helping to educate the employer in working with the disabled. He can also be of help in working with the students in helping them to solve actual job problems.

6. Diagnostic and evaluative services—the counselor can provide to the student all of the diagnostic and evaluative services which are available through DVR. This can include free general medical examinations, specialty medical examinations, speech and hearing examinations, and personal and work adjustment programs in private or public facilities (rehabilitation center, Goodwill Industries, etc.).

7. Purchasing specialized services—the counselor often can provide such services as corrective surgeries, glasses, hearing aids, therapy, special clothing, or tools needed for a particular job, and maintenance and/or transportation as needed in conjunction with all services.

8. Parental counseling—group counseling, etc. (as a team).

9. Placement and follow-up—whenever necessary, the counselor can provide regular job placement and follow-up services, thus assuring a continuous program for the student.

In addition, the special education teacher provides just as many and varied services and resources to the program, e.g.:

1. Helping students understand the "whys and wherefores" of vocational planning and work as one of life's major activities.

2. Interpreting the vocational implication of school learnings and adjusting the curriculum as changes in vocational conditions dictate.

3. Assisting the student in self-evaluation of vocational goals and development of good interpersonal skills and abilities.

4. Development of comprehensive cumulative record folders containing information pertinent to vocational planning and diagnosis.

5. Assisting parents to understand the vocational aspirations and limitations of the students enrolled in the special education program.

6. Providing planned experiences, e.g., role-playing in the classroom; in-school experience; or community visitations—for the development of attitudes and behaviors relevant to vocational adjustment.

In Summary

As both special education and vocational rehabilitation programs expand, it is logical and financially practical that both forces share facilities and resources in one continuous program of service. The disabled student needs all services that are available if he is to maintain a competitive position in today's fast moving world. Cooperative agreements are economically feasible as well as humanistic, and it has been demonstrated that the joining of forces is administratively feasible and operationally practical. Such a program can be sustained without infringing upon or duplicating of one agency's legal duties by the other. The resulting bond leads to stable, secure transition from the school environment to the living experience of the community.

The key word to all activities in their areas is *cooperation* (as included in the very title Cooperative Agreements). It matters little how detailed the contract is written—only the highest standards of professional cooperation will ensure success.

We here have been able to reach beyond our individual biases, prejudices, and professional jealousies, and develop program ideas for the disabled student. We do it not because it will be easy or that administrative problems will be minimal—but because it works and is good for the kids and the society in which they live.

PARTICIPANTS

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS CONFERENCE
February 12-13, 1968
Las Vegas, Nevada

Mrs. Helen Adamson
Supervisor of Special Education
State Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington

Floyd Baribeau
State Director of Special Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Capitol Building
Phoenix, Arizona

L. Owen Barnett
Director, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
123 Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Roger E. Bauer
Supervisor, Special Education
Montana Department of Public Instruction
Helena, Montana

Roy S. Berry
Director of Special Education Services
Washoe County School District
425 East Ninth Street
Reno, Nevada

Mrs. Eleanor Bodahl
Consultant, Special Education
Idaho Department of Education
Boise, Idaho

James A. Bradshaw
Consultant, Mentally Handicapped
State Office Building, Room 430
Denver, Colorado

Irvin F. Bryan
Planning Supervisor, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
P.O. Box 528
Olympia, Washington

Dr. G. Newton Buker
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
State Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington

L. Wayne Campbell
Curriculum Specialist in Mental Retardation

California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California

Dr. Kenneth Card
Director of Special Education
Department of Education
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana

Dr. Dorothy B. Carr
Supervisor, Special Education Branch
Los Angeles City School Districts
Box 3307, Los Angeles, California

J. C. Carver
State Director, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
506 Power Block
Helena, Montana

Edward L. Chouinard
Acting Regional Assistant Commissioner
Rehabilitation Services Administration
Federal Office Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California

Aud F. Darr
Director, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
P.O. Box 2406
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Larry Davis
State Director of Special Education
Nevada State Department of Public Instruction
Carson City, Nevada

Dr. William L. Findley
Special Education Supervisor
Great Falls Public Schools
1100 Fourth Street South
Great Falls, Montana

Vaden Floch
Director, Vocational Special Education
Lewiston Senior High School
P.O. Box 662
Lewiston, Idaho

James P. Forrestal
Director, Special Education
New Mexico Department of Education
Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Mrs. Laura Ganoung
Special Education Programs
Tucson Public Schools
Tucson, Arizona

Michael M. Guariglia
Administrator, Rehabilitation Division
515 East Musser Street
Carson City, Nevada

Vaughn L. Hall
State Administrator, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
1200 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah

Ron Hammett
Assistant Director, Department of Vocational Rehabilitation
Administration Office
1178 Chemeketa Street
Salem, Oregon

Ezra M. Hawks
Facilities and Workshop Specialist
Vocational Rhabilitation Service
210 Eastman Building
Boise, Idaho

Timmy Hirata
Acting District Superintendent
Honolulu District Schools
Honolulu, Hawaii

M. W. Holdship
State Director, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
7 North 15th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

Mrs. Ruth H. James
Resource Teacher for Secondary Special Education
Albuquerque Public Schools
724 Maple Street, S.E. Box 1927
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. Sara Lyon James
Director, Division of Exceptional Children
Wyoming Department of Education
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Dr. Hatsuko F. Kawahara
Director, Special Services Branch

Hawaii Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii

Philip G. Ladas
Consultant, Cooperative School Programs
Department of Rehabilitation
1500 Fifth Street
Sacramento, California

James Leathers
Consultant, Division of Special Education
Arizona Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Phoenix, Arizona

Mrs. Edith Longwith
Coordinator Special Programs
Sheridan County School District #7
Sheridan, Wyoming

Dr. Daniel McAlees
Coordinator, Rehabilitation Counselor Training
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado

Dr. Parnell McLaughlin
Director, Vocational Rehabilitation
705 State Services Building
Denver, Colorado

James Marshall
Director, Division of Special Education
Kansas State Department of Public Instruction
Topeka, Kansas

Burton Miller
Coordinator of Special Education
Board of Education
440 East First South
Salt Lake City, Utah

Toshio Nishioka
Oahu Vocational Rehabilitation Administrator
451 Lani Street
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dr. Elwood Pace
Coordinator, Special Education Programs
State Department of Public Instruction

136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah

Mrs. Maxine Padberg
Mesa Public Schools
Mesa, Arizona

Ernest E. Polley
Acting Consultant, Special Education
Alaska State Department of Public Instruction
Alaska Office Building
Juneau, Alaska

Mrs. Dorothy M. Siegel
Coordinator of Special Education
Clark County School District
Las Vegas, Nevada

Vincent D. Smith
Director, Special Services
Federal Way Public Schools
Department of Pupil Personnel
1430 South 308th
Federal Way, Washington

Richard J. Sonnen
Consultant, Program for Mentally Retarded Children
Oregon State Department of Education
Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon

Edgar Taylor, Jr.
Director of Special Education
Department of Special Education
Portland Public Schools
220 N.E. Beech Street
Portland, Oregon

Theodore White
Director, Special Education
Denver Public Schools
414 - 14th Street
Denver, Colorado

Dr. Ernest P. Willenberg
Director, Division of Special Education
Los Angeles Board of Education
P.O. Box 3307, Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, California

WICHE Staff Attending:
Dr. Gene Hensley, Project Director

27:2M:668:EP:3F6

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. William Abraham
Chairman
Dept. of Special Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 82581

Dr. Martin Acker
Rehabilitation Counselor
Training
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Mrs. Eleanor Bodahl
Consultant
Special Education
Idaho Department
of Education
Boise, Idaho 83702

James Burress
Regional Commissioner
Social and Rehabilitation
Services
Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dr. Kenneth Card
Director
Special Education
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

Dr. Joseph S. Lerner
Chairman
Special Education
Department
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California 94132

Dr. Dan McAlees
Director
Rehabilitation Counselor
Training
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado 80631

Dr. Parnell McLaughlin
Director
Vocational Rehabilitation
State of Colorado
State Services Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dr. Charles Ryan
College of Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84321

Dr. David W. Smith
Coordinator
Rehabilitation Counselor
Training
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dr. Tony Vaughan
Director
Special Education
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado 80631

Dr. Ernest Willenberg
Director
Division of
Special Education
Los Angeles Board
of Education
P.O. Box 3307
Terminal Annex
Los Angeles, California 90054

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Dr. Dorothy B. Carr

Floyd Baribeau

Dr. Daniel McAlees

Dr. Parnell McLaughlin